

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
CHARLESTON DIVISION

VERNESIA TODD,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
vs.)	Case No. 2:14-cv-01833-TLW
)	
COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL)	
SECURITY ADMINISTRATION,)	
)	
Defendant.)	
_____)	

ORDER

Plaintiff Vernesia Todd brought this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) to obtain judicial review of the Commissioner of the Social Security Administration’s (“Defendant”) final decision denying her claim for disability insurance benefits. This matter is before the Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (“the Report”) filed by United States Magistrate Judge Mary Gordon Baker, to whom this case was assigned pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2)(a), (D.S.C.). In the Report, the Magistrate Judge recommends that this Court reverse Defendant’s decision and remand the case for further administrative action. (Doc. #23). Defendant filed a notice stating that she will not submit objections to the Report (Doc. #25), and this matter is now ripe for decision.

The Court is charged with conducting a de novo review of any portion of the Report to which a specific objection is registered, and may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendations contained therein. 28 U.S.C. § 636. However, in the absence of objections to the Report, the Court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the Magistrate Judge’s recommendation. See Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 200 (4th Cir. 1983). In such a

case, “a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.’” Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co., 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note). Furthermore, a party’s failure to file specific written objections to the Report waives the right to appellate review of that claim. See id. at 315-16.

The Court has carefully reviewed the Report. Having found no clear error on the face of the record, it is hereby **ORDERED** that the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation is **ACCEPTED**. (Doc. #23). For the reasons articulated by the Magistrate Judge, the Commissioner’s decision is **REVERSED**, and this matter is **REMANDED** for further proceedings, as discussed in the Report.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ Terry L. Wooten
Terry L. Wooten
Chief United States District Judge

July 30, 2015
Columbia, South Carolina